

**REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action mailed January 27, 2004, claims 5, 11, 15 and 24-27 have been cancelled, claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 12, 13 and 23 have been amended. Claims 1-4, 6-14 and 16-23 are now active in this application, of which claims 1, 6, 8 and 13 are independent.

Entry of the Amendments and Remarks is respectfully requested because entry of Amendment places the present application in condition for allowance, or in the alternative, better form for appeal. No new matters are believed to be added by these Amendments.

Based on the above Amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the outstanding objections and rejections and they be withdrawn.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103***

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-5, 8, 9, 12-24 and 23-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 5,966,191 issued to Lee ("Lee") in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,442,470 issued to Hashimoto ("Hashimoto"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In this response, claim 5, 11, 15 and claims 24-27 have been cancelled. Also, allowable claim 6 has been rewritten to present in independent form by incorporating claims 1 and 5. Claim 8 has been rewritten to present in independent form by incorporating claim 1 and allowable dependent claim 11. Claim 13 has been rewritten to present in independent form by incorporating claim 1 and allowable dependent claim 15. Thus, it is submitted that claims 6-11 and 13-22 contain allowable subject matter.

Also, independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify the difference between the claimed invention and the cited references. Amended claim 1 recites:

“...  
a flexible circuit board having a first portion attached to the liquid crystal display panel and a second portion extended from the first portion;  
a receiving recess formed on an outer side surface of the sidewall and receiving the second portion of the flexible circuit board;  
...  
a support member configured to fit into the receiving recess and inserted into the receiving recess to fix the second portion of the flexible circuit board therebetween”

As the Examiner admitted, “Lee does not explicitly disclose a support means for supporting said flexible circuit towards said mold frame” (Office Action, page 3). Also, Lee fails to disclose or suggest “a receiving recess formed on an outer side surface of the sidewall and receiving the second portion of the flexible circuit board” and “a support member configured to fit into the receiving recess and inserted into the receiving recess to fix the second portion of the flexible circuit board therebetween”.

It is submitted that Hashimoto fails to cure the deficiency from Lee. Particularly, Hashimoto fails to disclose or suggest “a receiving recess formed on *an outer side surface of the sidewall and receiving the second portion of the flexible circuit board*” and “a support member configured to *fit into the receiving recess and inserted into the receiving recess* to fix the second portion of the flexible circuit board therebetween”

Since none of the cited references discloses or suggests these claimed features, it would not have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine them to arrive at the claimed invention. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Lee and Hashimoto.

Claims 3, 4, 12 and 23 that are dependent from claim 1 would be also patentable at least for the same reason.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over claims 1, 3, 4, 6-10, 12-14, 16-23 be withdrawn.

***Other Matters***


In addition to the claim amendments mentioned above, claims 1, 3, 4, 12 and 23 have been further amended for better wording and clarification and to be consistent with the amendment made to claim 1.

**CONCLUSION**

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, claims 1-4, 6-14 and 16-23 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park  
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: March 29, 2004

**McGuireWoods LLP**  
1750 Tysons Boulevard  
Suite 1800  
McLean, VA 22102-4215  
Tel: 703-712-5365  
Fax: 703-712-5280  
HCP:WSC/tmk

\\COM\387821.1